

DOUGLAS H. MEAL (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
dmeal@orrick.com  
MATTHEW D. LABRIE (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
mlabrie@orrick.com  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
222 Berkeley Street  
Suite 2000  
Boston, MA 02116-3740  
Telephone: +1 617 880 1800  
Facsimile: +1 617 880 1801

REBECCA HARLOW (STATE BAR NO. 281931)

rharlow@orrick.com

# ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

## The Orrick Building

405 Howard Street

San Francisco, CA 94105-2669

Telephone: +1 415 773 5700

Facsimile: +1 415 773 5759

## Attorneys for Defendant Zoo

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JUAN FLORES-MENDEZ, an individual and  
TRACY GREENAMYER, an individual, and  
on behalf of classes of similarly situated  
individuals,

### **Plaintiffs,**

V.

ZOOSK, INC., a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:20-cv-4929-WHA

**DECLARATION OF REBECCA  
HARLOW IN SUPPORT OF  
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO SEAL  
PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 79-5(F)**

JUDGE: The Honorable William Alsup

1 I, Rebecca Harlow, hereby declare as follows:

2       1. I am an associate at the law firm Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP, counsel of  
3 record for Defendant, Zoosk, Inc. (“Zoosk”) in the above-captioned litigation.

4       2. I submit this Civil Local Rule 79-5(c)(1) Declaration pursuant to Civil Local Rule  
5 79-5(f)(3) in support of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Seal and Motion to Consider Whether Another Party’s  
6 Material Should be Sealed Pursuant to Local Rule 79-5(F) (ECF No. 216). I have knowledge of  
7 the facts set forth herein, and if called upon as a witness, I could testify to them competently under  
8 oath.

9                         \*           \*           \*

10      3. On June 24, 2022, Plaintiffs filed a Motion to Seal and Motion to Consider Whether  
11 Another Party’s Material Should be Sealed Pursuant to Local Rule 79-5(F). ECF 216.

12      4. I have reviewed the parties’ Stipulated Protective Order (ECF 69) and the Court’s  
13 Protective Order (ECF 71) which approved of the parties’ Stipulated Protective Order, subject to  
14 various conditions.

15      5. Plaintiffs’ Reply in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification refers to,  
16 incorporates, and attaches as exhibits material designated “Confidential” by Zoosk pursuant to the  
17 Protective Order (the “Designated Material”).

18      6. The Designated Material sets forth detailed confidential information concerning,  
19 *inter alia*, (i) Zoosk’s data security and incident response practices; (ii) actions taken by Zoosk to  
20 prevent and protect against unauthorized intrusion into its network; and (iii) Zoosk’s detailed  
21 financial reports. Indeed, the Designated Material includes correspondence between counsel  
22 concerning Zoosk’s information security practices and financial information, as well as portions of  
23 briefing discussing and quoting documents produced by Zoosk during discovery relating to these  
24 topics and Zoosk’s written discovery responses related to Zoosk’s data security and finances.

25      7. California law requires a party seeking to seal records in or attached to a non-  
26 dispositive motion to demonstrate good cause exists to seal such records. “A ‘good cause’ showing  
27 under [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure] 26(c) will suffice to keep sealed records attached to non-

1 dispositive motions. *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180 (9th Cir. 2006).  
 2 Rule 26(c) states that if “good cause” is shown in discovery, a district court may issue “any order  
 3 which justice requires to protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or  
 4 undue burden or expense.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). “For good cause to exist, the party seeking  
 5 protection bears the burden of showing specific prejudice or harm will result if no protective order  
 6 is granted.” *Phillips ex rel. Ests. of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1210–11 (9th Cir.  
 7 2002). “The law . . . gives district courts broad latitude to grant protective orders to prevent  
 8 disclosure of materials for many types of information, including, *but not limited to*, trade secrets or  
 9 other confidential research, development, or commercial information.” *Id.* (citing Fed. R. Civ. P.  
 10 26(c)(7)). “When a court grants a protective order for information produced during discovery, it  
 11 already has determined that ‘good cause’ exists to protect this information from being disclosed to  
 12 the public by balancing the needs for discovery against the need for confidentiality.” *Id.* at 1213.  
 13 “Therefore, when a party attaches a sealed discovery document to a nondispositive motion, the  
 14 usual presumption of the public’s right of access is rebutted.” *Id.*

15       8. Good cause exists to seal the Designated Material. The Designated Material  
 16 constitutes confidential proprietary information, including but not limited to confidential research,  
 17 development, and commercial information. Failure to seal and disclosure of the Designated  
 18 Material will expose Zoosk and the PII of Zoosk’s users to an exponentially increased risk of  
 19 unauthorized access and criminal hacking. Failure to seal and disclosure of the Designated Material  
 20 will also cause competitive harm to Zoosk.

21       9. For the foregoing reasons and pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(f) and Federal Rule  
 22 of Civil Procedure 26, the Designated Material should be sealed and Plaintiffs’ Motion should be  
 23 granted.<sup>1</sup>

---

24       25       26       27       28  
 1 Plaintiffs filed a Proposed Order in connection with the Motion to Seal and Motion to Consider  
 Whether Another Party’s Material Should be Sealed Pursuant to Local Rule 79-5(F), seeking to  
 seal documents Plaintiffs’ filed in connection with their Reply In Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion  
 for Class Certification, but the Proposed Order appears to have erroneously referred to Plaintiffs’  
 Motion to Strike filed concurrently. Compare ECF 216 with ECF 216-5. Zoosk therefore  
 requests that the instant motion be granted and the Court enter an order granting the relief sought  
 in the Motion.

1 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing  
2 is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed in Berkeley, California on July 1, 2022.

3   
4

5 \_\_\_\_\_  
6 Rebecca C. Harlow  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28